arXiv:1602.01109v1 [q-fin.PM] 2 Feb 2016

On the existence of shadow prices for optimal investment with random endowment*

Lingqi Gu[1], Yiqing Lin[†1, 2], and Junjian Yang[1]

[1]Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Wien, Oskar-Morgenstern Platz 1, A-1090 Wien, Austria
[2]Centre de Mathématiques Appliqées, École Polytechnique, F-91128 Palaiseau Cedex, France

February 4, 2016

Abstract

In this paper, we consider a numéraire-based utility maximization problem under proportional transaction costs and random endowment. Assuming that the agent cannot short sell assets and is endowed with a strictly positive contingent claim, a primal optimizer of this utility maximization problem exists. Moreover, we observe that the original market with transaction costs can be replaced by a frictionless shadow market that yields the same optimality. On the other hand, we present an example to show that in some case when these constraints are relaxed, the existence of shadow prices is still warranted.

MSC2010. 91B16; 91G10

Keywords. Utility maximization, random endowment, transaction costs, no-short-selling constraints, shadow prices

1 Introduction

Recently, the problem of utility maximization in markets under proportional transaction costs has received many authors' attention. In such a frictional market, the investor is assumed to buy securities at an ask price which is higher than the bid one that he/she receives when selling. The presence of proportional transaction costs enables the consideration of the portfolio optimization with models beyond semimartingales in an arbitrage-free way, which is economically meaningful (cf. [16, 17]). Moreover, it is observed that even small transaction costs could dramatically influence the optimal choice of the investor in utility maximization (cf. [27]). Therefore, a natural question that arises is whether impacts of transactions costs on both the optimal strategy and the maximal utility can be reproduced in a frictionless market; mathematically speaking, for a given utility maximization problem, we wonder whether there exists a semimartingale process lying between the bid and ask price, called *shadow price*, such

*The authors gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) under grant P25815 and from the European Research Council under ERC Advanced Grant 321111. This work is partially done during the visit of L. Gu and J. Yang hosted by Prof. N. Touzi at CMAP, École Polytechnique, which is very much appreciated.

†corresponding author: yiqing.lin@polytechnique.edu

that trading frictionlessly for this price process leads to the same optimality under transaction costs. The answer to this question is affirmative in finite probability spaces according to Kallsen and Muhle-Karbe [22]. However, for more general settings, this question is elusive.

With geometric Brownian motion models, Kallsen and Muhle-Karbe [21] considered the optimal investment and consumption problem with logarithmic utility in an infinite horizon by employing tools from stochastic control and constructed explicitly a shadow price by solving a free boundary problem. In the same framework, this idea was afterward generalized in [3, 18] for power utility to derive a shadow price. By the same token, Gerhold et al. [13, 12] constructed shadow prices for logarithmic and long-run power utility functions when the time horizon becomes finite.

Apart from the stochastic control approach, the existence of shadow prices is also investigated in more general models by convex duality. This dates back to the work of Cvitanić and Karatzas [4] in the Itô framework with utility functions on $\mathbb{R}_+$. In [4], the authors showed that if the solution of a suitable dual problem could be attained by a so-called *consistent price system* (CPS) which is a (local) martingale, then the optimal solution could be characterized by solving a hedging problem in the "shadow" market associated with this CPS. This "folklore" has been clarified and sharpened very recently by Czichowsky et al. in two aspects: first, it is observed in [6] that the result of Cvitanić and Karatzas holds true even in the framework of general càdlàg stock-price processes S with only natural regularity condition on utility functions; secondly, a sufficient (but not necessary) condition for ensuring the local martingale property of the optimal dual processes is provided in [8], that is, S is continuous and satisfies "no unbounded profit with bounded risk" (NUPBR). Furthermore, the notion of shadow price is generalized to a sandwiched form in [6]. This idea is afterward brought by Bayraktar and Yu [1] to study a similar problem but with random endowment: they constructed shadow prices in the sandwiched sense, whenever the duality result holds and a sufficient condition on the dual optimizer is assumed. When the utility function is defined on the whole real line, Czichowsky and Schachermayer [7] proved that the dual optimizer defines a shadow price as long as the primal optimizer is attainable. In particular, this can be ensured if S is an exponential fractional Brownian motion. In addition, we refer to [26] for the generalization of the results in [7] with random endowment.

Instead of studying the the dual optimizer, Loewenstein [28] constructed shadow markets directly from the derivatives of dynamic primal value functions under no-short-selling constraints. This argument is based on the existence of the constrained primal solution, which was a hypothesis assumed by [28] but has been indeed obtained by Benedetti et al. [2] when they applied Loewenstein's approach in a different version of Kabanov's multi-currency model.

In this paper, we consider a numéraire-based utility maximization problem with proportional transaction costs and random endowment under no-short-selling constraints. First, we are inspired by the argument in [29, Section 3.3] to prove the existence of constrained primal solutions. Then, assuming the agent is endowed with a positive random endowment rather than a deterministic initial wealth, we follow the lines of [28, 2] to construct a shadow price directly from the primal solution. On the other hand, we discuss the existence of shadow prices when the constraints are violated and the random endowment is allowed to be negative. We provide an example in the Black-Scholes framework with a constructive random endowment. In this example, shadow prices exist (but are not unique) and can be explicitly defined.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce notations and the formulation of the utility maximization problem under proportional transaction costs with random

endowment. Section 3 presents our main result, i.e., the existence of shadow prices under the no-short-selling constraint, which will be proved in Section 4. Next, we provide in Section 5 with an example which falls out of the framework studied in Section 3, however shadow prices can be explicitly defined. Finally, some auxiliary lemma and theorem are presented in Appendix.

2 Formulation of the problem

In this section, we shall briefly introduce the basic settings of the utility maximization problem in markets with random endowment and transaction costs, as well as the definition of the shadow price in the classical sense. The reader, who has more interests in details of these topics, is referred to [21, 22, 2, 5, 8].

We consider a numéraire-based model: the financial market consists of two assets, one bond and one stock, where the price of the bond B is constant and normalized to $B \equiv 1$. We denote by $S = (S_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ the price process of the stock, which is based on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}, \mathbf{P})$ satisfying the usual hypotheses of right continuity and saturatedness, where $\mathcal{F}_0$ is assumed to be trivial. Here, T is a finite time horizon. In the sequel, we denote $L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ by L^0 and $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ by L^1. Throughout the paper we make the following assumption:

Assumption 2.1. *The price process $S = (S_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ is adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$, with càdlàg and strictly positive paths. Additionally, $\mathcal{F}_{T-} = \mathcal{F}_T$.*

Similarly to [8], we introduce proportional transaction costs $0 < \lambda < 1$ for the trading of the stock, which models the width of the bid-ask spread. The agent has to pay a higher ask price S_t to buy stock shares but only receives a lower bid price $(1-\lambda)S_t$ when selling them.

As the counterpart of martingale measures in the frictionless case, consistent price systems (CPSs) play a very important role in the framework with transaction costs (compare, e.g., [20, 31]). In the present paper, to establish the utility maximization problem, we adopt an extended notion – λ-supermartingale-CPSs, similarly defined as in [2].

Definition 2.2. *Fix $\lambda > 0$ and the price process $S = (S_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ satisfying Assumption 2.1. A λ-supermartingale-CPS is a couple of two positive processes $Z = (Z_t^0, Z_t^1)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ consisting of two supermartingales Z^0 and Z^1, such that*

$$S_t^Z := \frac{Z_t^1}{Z_t^0} \in [(1-\lambda)S_t, S_t], \quad a.s., \tag{2.1}$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq T$.

The set of all λ-supermartingale-CPSs is denoted by $\mathcal{Z}_{sup}^{\lambda}$.

We introduce now the following assumption on the existence of a supermartingale-CPS, which is an analogue to the existence of an equivalent supermartingale density in the frictionless setting.

Assumption 2.3. *For some $0 < \lambda' < \lambda$, we have that $\mathcal{Z}_{sup}^{\lambda'} \neq \emptyset$.*

In this market under transaction costs, the following definition of self-financing trading strategies is commonly adopted, e.g., in [30].

Definition 2.4. *Fix $\lambda \in (0,1)$. A self-financing trading strategy under transaction costs λ is a predictable $\mathbb{R}^2$-valued finite variation process $\varphi = (\varphi_t^0, \varphi_t^1)_{0\le t\le T}$ such that*

$$\int_s^t d\varphi_u^{0,\uparrow} = \int_s^t (1-\lambda) S_u d\varphi_u^{1,\downarrow}, \quad \int_s^t d\varphi_u^{0,\downarrow} = \int_s^t S_u d\varphi_u^{1,\uparrow},$$

for all $0 \le s \le t \le T$, where $\varphi^\uparrow$ and $\varphi^\downarrow$ denote the Jordan-Hahn decomposition of φ.

The processes φ_t^0 and φ_t^1 describe the amount of bond and the number of stock shares held at time $t \in [0,T]$.

We also assume that as well as trading in this market, the agent is endowed with an exogenous random endowment $\overline{e}_T$ at the terminal time T, which is represented by an $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable random variable.

Assumption 2.5. *The endowment $\overline{e}_T$ is a strictly positive and finite-valued random variable, which can be decomposed into a deterministic part and a random part, i.e., $\overline{e}_T = x + e_T$, where $x > 0$ and $e_T \ge 0$, a.s.*

Remark 2.6. Indeed, for the utility maximization problem, it has little matter when the agent receives the deterministic and riskless endowment x. Thus we may assume that x is the initial wealth of the agent and e_T is endowed at time T. We restrict our attention to the trading strategies starting from $(\varphi_0^0, \varphi_0^1) = (x, 0)$.

In this paper, we shall consider a utility maximization problem similar to the one in Benedetti et al. [2], where the agent is facing the no-short-selling constraint, which forces him to keep both the amount of bond and the number of stock shares postive. In other words, the agent is only allowed to trade with the admissible strategies defined as follows:

Definition 2.7. *Under transaction costs $\lambda \in (0,1)$, a self-financing strategy $\varphi = (\varphi^0, \varphi^1)$ with $(\varphi_0^0, \varphi_0^1) = (x, 0)$ and $(\varphi_T^0, \varphi_T^1) = (\varphi_T^0, 0)$ is called admissible, if for each $t \in [0,T]$ we have that*

$$\varphi_t^0 \ge 0 \ \text{ and } \ \varphi_t^1 \ge 0, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

We denote by $\mathcal{A}^\lambda(x)$ the collection of all such strategies. Moreover, we define

$$\mathcal{C}^\lambda(x) := \left\{ g \in L_+^0 \,\middle|\, g \le \varphi_T^0, \ \text{for some } \ (\varphi^0, \varphi^1) \in \mathcal{A}^\lambda(x) \right\}.$$

We suppose that the agent's preferences over terminal wealth are modeled by a utility function $U : (0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$, which is strictly increasing, strictly concave, continuously differentiable. Furthermore, the function U satisfies the Inada conditions, i.e.,

$$U'(0) := \lim_{x\to 0} U'(x) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad U'(\infty) := \lim_{x\to\infty} U'(x) = 0,$$

and the following condition of reasonable asymptotic elasticity (RAE).

Assumption 2.8. *The utility function U satisfies the reasonable asymptotic elasticity, i.e.,*

$$AE(U) := \limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{xU'(x)}{U(x)} < 1.$$

For financial interpretation and more results about the previous assumption, we refer to [24] and [25].

Without loss of generality, we may assume $U(\infty) > 0$ to simplify the analysis and we define $U(x) = -\infty$ whenever $x \leq 0$.

Then, the problem for the agent is to maximize expected utility at terminal time T from his bond account derived from trading and the random endowment, i.e.,

$$u(x; e_T) := \sup_{g \in \mathcal{C}^\lambda(x)} \mathbf{E}[U(g + e_T)]. \tag{2.2}$$

For $Z \in \mathcal{Z}^\lambda_{sup}$, define $S^Z := \frac{Z^1}{Z^0}$. By the definition, S^Z is a positive semimartingale taking values in $[(1-\lambda)S, S]$. Then, we can construct a frictionless market consisting of one bond with zero interest rate and an underlying asset, whose price process is S^Z. Adapting the previous setting under transaction costs, we adopt the following notion of self-financing trading strategies.

Definition 2.9. *In the frictionless market associated with S^Z, an $\mathbb{R}^2$-valued predictable process $\widetilde{\varphi} := (\widetilde{\varphi}^0_t, \widetilde{\varphi}^1_t)$ starting from $(x, 0)$ is a self-financing trading strategy, if $\widetilde{\varphi}^1$ is S^Z-integrable and*

$$\widetilde{\varphi}^0_t + \widetilde{\varphi}^1_t S^Z_t = x + \int_0^t \widetilde{\varphi}^1_u dS^Z_u, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Here, $\widetilde{\varphi}^0_t$ and $\widetilde{\varphi}^1_t$ describe the amount of bond and the number of stock shares held at time $t \in [0, T]$.

We shall formulate a utility maximization problem for the frictionless model with S^Z. In accordance with (2.2), we always assume that neither asset can be shorted, so that the maximization problem is established over all admissible strategies defined as follows.

Definition 2.10. *Let $S^Z := \frac{Z^1}{Z^0}$, for some $Z \in \mathcal{Z}^\lambda_{sup}$. A self-financing strategy $\widetilde{\varphi}$ is admissible, if we have*

$$\widetilde{\varphi}^0_t \geq 0 \ \text{ and } \ \widetilde{\varphi}^1_t \geq 0, \quad a.s.,$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq T$.

We denote by $\mathcal{A}^Z(x)$ the collection of all such admissible trading strategies starting from $(x, 0)$. Moreover, we define

$$\mathcal{C}^Z(x) := \left\{ \widetilde{g} \in L^0_+ \,\middle|\, \widetilde{g} \leq \widetilde{\varphi}^0_T + \widetilde{\varphi}^1_T S^Z_T, \ \text{for some } (\widetilde{\varphi}^0, \widetilde{\varphi}^1) \in \mathcal{A}^Z(x) \right\}.$$

Lemma 2.11. *Any payoff in the original market S with transaction costs can be dominated by that in the potentially more favorable frictionless markets, which is within the bid-ask spread. Namely, fix $Z \in \mathcal{Z}^\lambda_{sup}$ and let $(\varphi^0, \varphi^1) \in \mathcal{A}^\lambda(x)$ be arbitrary, then there exists a $(\widetilde{\varphi}^0, \widetilde{\varphi}^1) \in \mathcal{A}^Z(x)$ such that*

$$\widetilde{\varphi}^0_t \geq \varphi^0_t \ \text{ and } \ \widetilde{\varphi}^1_t \geq \varphi^1_t, \quad a.s., \tag{2.3}$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq T$.

Proof. For any $(\varphi^0, \varphi^1) \in \mathcal{A}^\lambda(x)$, since (φ^0, φ^1) is a λ-self-financing trading strategy, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_t^0 + \varphi_t^1 S_t^Z &= x + \int_0^t d\varphi_u^0 + \int_0^t \varphi_{u-}^1 dS_u^Z + \int_0^t S_u^Z d\varphi_u^1 \\ &= x + \int_0^t (d\varphi_u^0 + S_u^Z d\varphi_u^1) + \int_0^t \varphi_{u-}^1 dS_u^Z \leq x + \int_0^t \varphi_{u-}^1 dS_u^Z.\end{aligned}$$

Then, define a self-financing trading strategy in the frictionless market associated with S^Z by

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{\varphi}_t^0 := x + \displaystyle\int_0^t \varphi_{u-}^1 dS_u^Z - \varphi_t^1 S_t^Z \geq \varphi_t^0, \\ \widetilde{\varphi}_t^1 := \varphi_t^1, \end{cases}$$

which satisfies (2.3). □

Obviously, $\mathcal{C}^\lambda(x) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^Z(x)$, for any $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_{sup}^\lambda$. Therefore, letting

$$u^Z(x; e_T) := \sup_{\widetilde{g} \in \mathcal{C}^Z(x)} \mathbf{E}[U(\widetilde{g} + e_T)],$$

it follows that

$$u(x; e_T) \leq \inf_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}_{sup}^\lambda} u^Z(x; e_T),$$

which means each frictionless market with S^Z affords better, at least not worse, investment opportunity than the original frictional market. An interesting question is whether there exists a least favorable $\widehat{Z} \in \mathcal{Z}_{sup}^\lambda$, such that the gap is closed, i.e., the inequality becomes equality. If so, the corresponding price process $S^{\widehat{Z}} := \frac{\widehat{Z}^1}{\widehat{Z}^0}$ is called shadow price. Below is the definition of the shadow price similar to [2, Definition 3.9].

Definition 2.12. *Fix the initial value x and the terminal random endowment e_T. We assume that short selling of either asset is not allowed. Then, the process $S^{\widehat{Z}}$ associated with some $\widehat{Z} := \widehat{Z}(x, e_T) \in \mathcal{Z}_{sup}^\lambda$ is called a shadow price process, if*

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{C}^\lambda(x)} \mathbf{E}[U(g + e_T)] = \sup_{\widetilde{g} \in \mathcal{C}^{\widehat{Z}}(x)} \mathbf{E}[U(\widetilde{g} + e_T)].$$

3 Solvability of the problem and existence of shadow prices

In this section, we shall present our main result, that is, the solvability of (2.2) and the existence of shadow prices.

3.1 Main theorems

The existence of shadow prices for the utility maximization problem with neither the no-short-selling constraint nor random endowment has been studied in [22, 5, 6, 8] by duality methods. By contrast, we shall solve (2.2) directly by following the line of [2].

First of all, we display a superreplication theorem as an analogue of [2, Lemma 4.1]:

Lemma 3.1. *For any $Z \in \mathcal{Z}^{\lambda}_{sup}$, the process $Z^0\varphi^0 + Z^1\varphi^1$ is a positive supermartingale, for any $(\varphi^0, \varphi^1) \in \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}(x)$.*

Proof. As (φ^0, φ^1) is of finite variation and (Z^0, Z^1) is a supermartingale, we obtain by [19, Proposition I.4.49] that

$$\begin{aligned} Z^0_t\varphi^0_t + Z^1_t\varphi^1_t &= (Z^0_0\varphi^0_0 + Z^1_0\varphi^1_0) + \int_0^t (\varphi^0_{u-}dZ^0_u + \varphi^1_{u-}dZ^1_u) + \int_0^t (Z^0_u d\varphi^0_u + Z^1_u d\varphi^1_u) \\ &= x + \int_0^t (\varphi^0_{u-}dZ^0_u + \varphi^1_{u-}dZ^1_u) + \int_0^t (Z^0_u d\varphi^0_u + Z^1_u d\varphi^1_u). \end{aligned}$$

The first integral defines a supermartingale due to the positivity of φ^0 and φ^1. The second integral defines a decreasing process by the fact that (φ^0, φ^1) is λ-self-financing and that $\frac{Z^1_u}{Z^0_u}$ takes values in $[(1-\lambda)S_u, S_u]$. Therefore, the process $Z^0\varphi^0 + Z^1\varphi^1$ is a positive supermartingale. □

Remark 3.2. Comparing with [31, Theorem 1.4], we require less on the underlying asset price S for the superreplication theorem, since we are working with a smaller set of trading strategies.

Furthermore, we have some properties of the convex sets $\mathcal{A}^{\lambda}(x)$ and $\mathcal{C}^{\lambda}(x)$ as follows.

Lemma 3.3. *Under Assumption 2.1 and 2.3, the total variation* $\mathrm{Var}(\varphi^0)$ *and* $\mathrm{Var}(\varphi^1)$ *remain bounded in L^0, when φ runs through $\mathcal{A}^{\lambda}(x)$.*

Proof. Write $\varphi^0 = \varphi^{0,\uparrow} - \varphi^{0,\downarrow}$ and $\varphi^1 = \varphi^{1,\uparrow} - \varphi^{1,\downarrow}$ as the canonical differences of increasing processes. Then, we could define a strategy $\widetilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{A}^{\lambda'}(x)$ by

$$\widetilde{\varphi}_t := \left(\varphi^0_t + \frac{\lambda - \lambda'}{1-\lambda}\varphi^{0,\uparrow}_t, \varphi^1_t\right), \quad 0 \le t \le T,$$

and prove by Lemma 3.1 that for $Z \in \mathcal{Z}^{\lambda'}_{sup}$,

$$\frac{\lambda - \lambda'}{1-\lambda}\mathbf{E}\left[Z^0_T\varphi^{0,\uparrow}_T\right] \le \mathbf{E}[Z^0_T\varphi^0_T + Z^1_T\varphi^1_T] + \frac{\lambda - \lambda'}{1-\lambda}\mathbf{E}\left[Z^0_T\varphi^{0,\uparrow}_T\right] \le x.$$

The reminder of the proof is identical with the one of [31, Lemma 3.1]. □

Then, we state the following lemma without proof and refer the reader to [31, Theorem 3.4].

Lemma 3.4. *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3, the set $\mathcal{C}^{\lambda}(x)$ is convex closed and bounded in L^0_+.*

In what follows, we shall establish the existence and uniqueness result for the primal solution of (2.2). The spirit of the proof is revealed in [29] (compare also [15] and [2]). However, we observe that the positivity of $(f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in [29, Lemma 3.16] is not essentially needed for the proof of the existence. Thus, we reorganize a proof in the Appendix.

Theorem 3.5. *Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.3, 2.5 and 2.8 hold. Assume moreover that*

$$u(x; e_T) < \infty.$$

Then, the utility maximization problem (2.2) *admits a unique solution $\widehat{g} \in \mathcal{C}^{\lambda}(x)$.*

Now we turn to consider the frictionless market associated with S^Z, for $Z \in \mathcal{Z}^\lambda_{sup}$. Similarly to Lemma 3.1, we have the supermartingale property of $Z^0\widetilde{\varphi}^0 + Z^1\widetilde{\varphi}^1$ for $(\widetilde{\varphi}^0, \widetilde{\varphi}^1) \in \mathcal{A}^Z(x)$. The subsequent lemma has been reviewed in [2, Lemma 4.1]. However, for the convenience of the reader, we prove it in the numéraire-based case.

Lemma 3.6. *Fix $Z \in \mathcal{Z}^\lambda_{sup}$. The process $Z^0\widetilde{\varphi}^0 + Z^1\widetilde{\varphi}^1$ is a positive supermartingale, for any $(\widetilde{\varphi}^0, \widetilde{\varphi}^1) \in \mathcal{A}^Z(x)$.*

Proof. Note that $Z^0\widetilde{\varphi}^0 + Z^1\widetilde{\varphi}^1 = Z^0\big(\widetilde{\varphi}^0 + \widetilde{\varphi}^1 S^Z\big) = Z^0\big(x + \widetilde{\varphi}^1 \bullet S^Z\big)$ by the frictionless self-financing condition. Using Itô's formula and [14, Proposition A.1], we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} Z^0_t\widetilde{\varphi}^0_t + Z^1_t\widetilde{\varphi}^1_t &= xZ^0_0 + \big((\widetilde{\varphi}^0_- + \widetilde{\varphi}^1_- S^Z_-) \bullet Z^0\big)_t + \big(Z^0_- \bullet (\widetilde{\varphi}^1 \bullet S^Z)\big)_t + \big[\widetilde{\varphi}^1 \bullet S^Z, Z^0\big]_t \\ &= xZ^0_0 + \big((\widetilde{\varphi}^0_- + \widetilde{\varphi}^1_- S^Z_-) \bullet Z^0\big)_t + \big(\widetilde{\varphi}^1 \bullet (Z^0_- \bullet S^Z)\big)_t + \big(\widetilde{\varphi}^1 \bullet \big[S^Z, Z^0\big]\big)_t. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the frictionless self-financing condition again and [19, I.4.36] that

$$\Delta(\widetilde{\varphi}^0 + \widetilde{\varphi}^1 S^Z) = \Delta(\widetilde{\varphi}^1 \bullet S^Z) = \widetilde{\varphi}^1 \Delta S^Z,$$

therefore, $\widetilde{\varphi}^0_- + \widetilde{\varphi}^1_- S^Z_- = \widetilde{\varphi}^0 + \widetilde{\varphi}^1 S^Z_-$. By [19, I.4.37, Definition I.4.45], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z^0_t\widetilde{\varphi}^0_t + Z^1_t\widetilde{\varphi}^1_t &= xZ^0_0 + \big(\widetilde{\varphi}^0 \bullet Z^0\big)_t + \big(\widetilde{\varphi}^1 \bullet \big(S^Z_- \bullet Z^0 + Z^0_- \bullet S^Z + [S^Z, Z^0]\big)\big)_t \\ &= xZ^0_0 + \big(\widetilde{\varphi}^0 \bullet Z^0\big)_t + \big(\widetilde{\varphi}^1 \bullet (S^Z Z^0)\big)_t \\ &= xZ^0_0 + \big(\widetilde{\varphi}^0 \bullet Z^0\big)_t + \big(\widetilde{\varphi}^1 \bullet Z^1\big)_t, \end{aligned}$$

which is a positive local supermartingale and hence a supermartingale. □

Then, it is easy to deduce that for $\widetilde{g} \in \mathcal{C}^Z(x)$,

$$\mathbf{E}[U(\widetilde{g} + e_T)] \le \mathbf{E}[V(Z^0_T) + Z^0_T(\widetilde{g} + e_T)] \le \mathbf{E}[V(Z^0_T)] + \mathbf{E}[Z^0_T e_T] + Z^0_0 x, \tag{3.1}$$

for each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}^\lambda_{sup}$, where V is the conjugate of U. Therefore, to prove the existence of shadow prices, it suffices to have the following lemma, whose proof is postponed to the next subsection.

Lemma 3.7. *Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.3, 2.5 and 2.8 hold. There exists a $\widehat{Z} \in \mathcal{Z}^\lambda_{sup}$, such that*

(i) $\widehat{Z}^0_T = U'(\widehat{g} + e_T)$;

(ii) $\mathbf{E}[\widehat{Z}^0_T \widehat{g}] = \widehat{Z}^0_0 x$.

Theorem 3.8. *The λ-supermartingale-CPS $\widehat{Z} \in \mathcal{Z}^\lambda_{sup}$ satisfying Lemma 3.7 (i)-(ii) defines a shadow price $S^{\widehat{Z}} := \frac{\widehat{Z}^1}{\widehat{Z}^0}$.*

Proof. Consider the frictionless market associated with $S^{\widehat{Z}}$. By Lemma 3.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u^{\widehat{Z}}(x; e_T) \ge u(x; e_T) &= \mathbf{E}[U(\widehat{g} + e_T)] = \mathbf{E}[V(\widehat{Z}^0_T) + \widehat{Z}^0_T(\widehat{g} + e_T)] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[V(\widehat{Z}^0_T)] + \mathbf{E}[\widehat{Z}^0_T e_T] + \widehat{Z}^0_0 x \ge u^{\widehat{Z}}(x; e_T), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (3.1). The inequality above implies $u^{\widehat{Z}}(x; e_T) = u(x; e_T)$, which proves that $S^{\widehat{Z}}$ is a shadow price for the problem (2.2). □

Remark 3.9. As has been indicated in [2], by the strict concavity of u, $\widehat{g}$ is the unique solution in $\mathcal{C}^{\widehat{\widetilde{Z}}}(x)$ for the frictionless problem $u^{\widehat{\widetilde{Z}}}(x;e_T)$. Moreover, the trading strategy $\widehat{\varphi}$, that attains the maximality in the frictional market, does the same in the frictionless one associated with the shadow price $S^{\widehat{\widetilde{Z}}}$. Therefore, the optimal trading strategy $(\widehat{\varphi}^0,\widehat{\varphi}^1)$ for S under transaction costs λ satisfies

$$\{d\widehat{\varphi}^1_t>0\}\subseteq\{S^{\widehat{\widetilde{Z}}}_t=S_t\},$$
$$\{d\widehat{\varphi}^1_t<0\}\subseteq\{S^{\widehat{\widetilde{Z}}}_t=(1-\lambda)S_t\},$$

for all $0\leq t\leq T$.

Remark 3.10. In our case, shadow prices are determined not only by the random endowment but also by its decomposition (see Assumption 2.5). The decomposition of the random endowment together with the no-short-selling constraints can be explained as the agent's trading rule created by his/her controller. Precisely, if the random endowment $\widetilde{e}_T$ that the agent will eventually receive is decomposed into $x+e_T$ by his/her controller, then it means that the agent is allowed to borrow at most x in the bond market for trading the stock. Thus, the different ways of decomposition mean the different limits of short selling in bond, which lead to different maximal utilities and also shadow prices.

3.2 Proof of Lemma 3.7

In this subsection, we prove Lemma 3.7. Generally speaking, we shall follow the line of the proof of [2, Proposition 4.2]. Thus, we only give the sketch in order to show how it develops in the numéraire-based context and how a positive random endowment works. The proof is divided in several stages.

Firstly, the following dynamic programming principle, similar to [2, Lemma 4.4], can be verified as a special case of [11, Theorem 1.17].

Proposition 3.11. *Define*

$$\mathcal{U}_s(\varphi^0_s,\varphi^1_s):=\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{(\psi^0,\psi^1)\in\mathcal{A}^\lambda_{s,T}(\varphi^0_s,\varphi^1_s)}\mathbf{E}\left[U(\psi^0_T+e_T)\middle|\mathcal{F}_s\right],$$

where $\mathcal{A}^\lambda_{s,T}(\varphi^0_s,\varphi^1_s)$ is the set of all admissible λ-self-financing trading strategies, which agree with $\varphi\in\mathcal{A}^\lambda(x)$ in $[0,s]$.

Then, the process $\left(\mathcal{U}_s(\widehat{\varphi}^0_s,\widehat{\varphi}^1_s)\right)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ is a martingale i.e.,

$$\mathcal{U}_s(\widehat{\varphi}^0_s,\widehat{\varphi}^1_s)=\mathbf{E}\left[\mathcal{U}_t(\widehat{\varphi}^0_t,\widehat{\varphi}^1_t)\middle|\mathcal{F}_s\right],\quad a.s.,$$

for all optimal trading strategies $\widehat{\varphi}$ attaining $\widehat{g}$.

Proof. In the numéraire-based context, this proposition can be directly proved. Without loss of generality, it suffices to verify the following claim

$$\mathbf{E}\left[U(\psi^0_T+e_T)\middle|\mathcal{F}_s\right]\leq\mathbf{E}\left[U(\widehat{\varphi}^0_T+e_T)\middle|\mathcal{F}_s\right],\tag{3.2}$$

for all $(\psi^0,\psi^1)\in\mathcal{A}_{s,T}(\widehat{\varphi}^0_s,\widehat{\varphi}^1_s)$.

To obtain a contradiction, we suppose that (3.2) is not true, i.e., there exists a $(\psi^0, \psi^1) \in \mathcal{A}_{s,T}(\widehat{\varphi}_s^0, \widehat{\varphi}_s^1)$ and a set $A \subseteq \Omega$ with $\mathbf{P}(A) > 0$ defined as

$$A := \left\{ \mathbf{E}[U(\psi_T^0 + e_T)|\mathcal{F}_s] > \mathbf{E}[U(\widehat{\varphi}_T^0 + e_T)|\mathcal{F}_s] \right\} \in \mathcal{F}_s. \tag{3.3}$$

Then define

$$(\psi^0, \psi^1)\mathbf{1}_A + (\widehat{\varphi}^0, \widehat{\varphi}^1)\mathbf{1}_{A^c} =: (\eta^0, \eta^1) \in \mathcal{A}_{s,T}(\widehat{\varphi}_s^0, \widehat{\varphi}_s^1).$$

We have

$$\mathbf{E}\left[U(\eta_T^0 + e_T)\right] > \mathbf{E}\left[U(\widehat{\varphi}_T^0 + e_T)\right] = u(x; e_T).$$

which is in contradiction to the maximality of $\widehat{\varphi}$. Thus, by the definition of $\mathcal{U}_s(\varphi_s^0, \varphi_s^1)$ and (3.2), we obatin

$$\mathcal{U}_s(\widehat{\varphi}_s^0, \widehat{\varphi}_s^1) = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{(\psi^0,\psi^1)\in\mathcal{A}^\lambda(\widehat{\varphi}_s^0,\widehat{\varphi}_s^1)} \mathbf{E}\left[U(\psi_T^0 + e_T)\middle|\mathcal{F}_s\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[U(\widehat{\varphi}_T^0 + e_T)\middle|\mathcal{F}_s\right].$$

Finally, the tower property of conditional expectations yields the desired result. □

The next step goes in an exactly same way as in [2], i.e., we should first construct a pair $\widehat{Z} = (\widehat{Z}_t^0, \widehat{Z}_t^1)_{0\le t\le T}$, then verify the shadow price can be defined by $\frac{\widehat{Z}^1}{\widehat{Z}^0}$. The additional positive e_T in the dynamic will not alter the following results.

Proposition 3.12. *The following processes are well defined:*

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{Z}_t^0 := \lim\limits_{\varepsilon\searrow 0} \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\big(\mathcal{U}_t(\widehat{\varphi}_t^0 + \varepsilon, \widehat{\varphi}_t^1) - \mathcal{U}_t(\widehat{\varphi}_t^0, \widehat{\varphi}_t^1)\big), \\ \widetilde{Z}_t^1 := \lim\limits_{\varepsilon\searrow 0} \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\big(\mathcal{U}_t(\widehat{\varphi}_t^0, \widehat{\varphi}_t^1 + \varepsilon) - \mathcal{U}_t(\widehat{\varphi}_t^0, \widehat{\varphi}_t^1)\big), \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

for $0 \le t < T$, *and*

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{Z}_T^0 := U'(\widehat{\varphi}_T + e_T), \\ \widetilde{Z}_T^1 := U'(\widehat{\varphi}_T + e_T)(1-\lambda)S_T. \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

Furthermore, define

$$\begin{cases} \widehat{Z}_t^i := \lim\limits_{\substack{s\searrow t \\ s\in\mathbb{Q}}} \widetilde{Z}_s^i, & 0 \le t < T; \\ \widehat{Z}_t^i := \widetilde{Z}_T^i, & t = T. \end{cases} \tag{3.6}$$

Then, the process $\widehat{Z}$ *is a càdlàg supermartingale and moreover, for all* $0 \le t \le T$, *we have*

$$(1-\lambda)S_t \le \frac{\widehat{Z}_t^1}{\widehat{Z}_t^0} \le S_t, \quad a.s. \tag{3.7}$$

Consequently, $\widehat{Z}$ *is a* λ*-supermartingale-CPS.*

Sketch of the proof. Firstly, $\widetilde{Z}$ is well-defined, since the right-hand side of (3.4) is monotone due to the convexity of $\mathcal{U}_t$. Furthermore, the set

$$\left\{ \mathbf{E}\left[U(\psi_T^0 + e_T)\middle|\mathcal{F}_t\right] \;\middle|\; (\psi^0, \psi^1) \in \mathcal{A}_{t,T}(\widehat{\varphi}_t + \varepsilon e_i) \right\}$$

is directed upwards, thus there exists a sequence of

$$(\psi^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} = (\psi^{n,0}, \psi^{n,1})_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{t,T}(\widehat{\varphi}_t + \varepsilon e_i)$$

such that

$$\mathcal{U}_t(\widehat{\varphi}_t + \varepsilon e_i) =\nearrow - \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\left[U\big(\psi_T^{n,0} + e_T\big)\Big|\,\mathcal{F}_t\right].$$

Then, by proceeding a similar procedure as in the proof of [2, Proposition 4.5], we can verify the supermartingale property of $\widetilde{Z}$, which is not necessarily càdlàg. Recalling that $u(x;e_T)$ is finitely valued and concave on $\mathbb{R}_+$, we have that

$$\widetilde{y} := \widetilde{Z}_0^0 = \lim_{\varepsilon\searrow 0} \frac{u(x+\varepsilon;e_T) - u(x;e_T)}{\varepsilon}$$

takes finite values for $x > 0$. Consequently, by [23, Proposition 1.3.14(iii)], (3.6) is a well-defined càdlàg supermartingale. In particular, $\widehat{Z}_0^0 \le \widetilde{Z}_0^0$.

On the other hand, the proof of (3.7) goes in the same way as (57) in [28]. We complete the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 3.7. It remains to proof (2) in Lemma 3.7. Since $\big(\widehat{Z}^0, \widehat{Z}^1\big) \in \mathcal{Z}_{sup}^{\lambda}$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}\big[\widehat{Z}_T^0 \widehat{g}\big] \le \widehat{Z}_0^0 x. \tag{3.8}$$

It remains to show the reversed inequality. For $\alpha < 1$, we note that $u(\alpha x;e_T) \ge \mathbf{E}[U(\alpha\widehat{g} + e_T)]$. By the convexity of u, we obtain

$$\widetilde{Z}_0^0(x - \alpha x) \le u(x;e_T) - u(\alpha x;e_T) \le \mathbf{E}[U(\widehat{g}+e_T)] - \mathbf{E}[U(\alpha\widehat{g}+e_T)].$$

Therefore, it follows from the strict convexity and the continous differentiability of U that

$$\widetilde{Z}_0^0 x \le \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{U(\widehat{g}+e_T) - U(\alpha\widehat{g}+e_T)}{1-\alpha}\right] \le \mathbf{E}\left[U'(\alpha\widehat{g}+e_T)\widehat{g}\right]. \tag{3.9}$$

Letting $\alpha \nearrow 1$, monotone convergence yields

$$\widehat{Z}_0^0 x \le \widetilde{Z}_0^0 x \le \mathbf{E}\left[U'(\widehat{g}+e_T)\widehat{g}\right] \le \mathbf{E}\big[\widehat{Z}_T^0\widehat{g}\big]. \tag{3.10}$$

We complete the proof by comparing (3.8) and (3.10). □

Remark 3.13. We have seen here that the nonnegativity of the random endowment is important. This ensures the strict positivity of $\alpha\widehat{g} + e_T$, for $0 < \alpha < 1$, such that $\mathbf{E}\left[U'(\alpha\widehat{g}+e_T)\widehat{g}\right]$ in (3.9) is well defined.

4 When the random endowment becomes negative

In this section, we provide with a nontrivial example showing that even when the random endowment becomes negative, there may exist a shadow price for the utility maximization problem in the market under transaction costs. In particular, we discuss maximal trading strategies in the context with transaction costs. Notice that the random endowment constructed in our example is associated with such a maximal trading strategy.

4.1 Example

We consider the Black-Scholes model with finite time horizon. Assume that the market consists of a saving account with zero interest rate and a stock with price dynamics

$$S_t = \begin{cases} \exp\left(B_t + \frac{t}{2}\right), & 0 \le t \le T/2; \\ S_{T/2}, & T/2 < t \le T. \end{cases}$$

where $(B_t)_{t\ge 0}$ is a Brownian motion on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\ge 0}, \mathbf{P})$.

Now fix a level of transaction costs $\lambda \in (0,1)$. We assume that an agent is endowed with the initial capital $x = 1$ at time 0 and the random endowment $e_T := -\beta(1-\lambda)S_{T/2}$ at terminal time T, where β is an $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable $(0,1)$-valued uniformly distributed random variable which is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{T/2}$. Then, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. *The buy-hold-sell strategy*

$$\left(\widehat{\varphi}_t^0, \widehat{\varphi}_t^1\right) := \begin{cases} (1,0), & t = 0; \\ (0,1), & 0 < t < T/2; \\ \big((1-\lambda)S_{T/2}, 0\big), & T/2 \le t \le T, \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

solves the utility maximization problem (2.2).

Before proceeding the proof of this proposition, we first introduce the notion of maximal trading strategy in this market with transaction costs. Notice that a similar notion in frictionless markets is adopted by Delbean and Schachermayer in [9] for considering a superreplication problem.

Definition 4.2. *An element $\varphi_T^0 \in \mathcal{C}^\lambda(1)$ is called maximal, if for $\phi_T^0 \in \mathcal{C}^\lambda(1)$ satisfying $\phi_T^0 \ge \varphi_T^0$, a.s., we have $\phi_T^0 = \varphi_T^0$, a.s. A trading strategy (φ^0, φ^1) is called maximal in $\mathcal{A}^\lambda(1)$, if it is associated with $(\varphi_T^0, 0)$, where φ_T^0 is a maximal element in $\mathcal{C}^\lambda(1)$.*

Remark 4.3. The existence of a maximal element in $\mathcal{C}^\lambda(1)$ could be deduced by transfinite induction, provided that $\mathcal{C}^\lambda(1)$ is bounded in L^0 and closed w.r.t. convergence in probability (cf. Schachermayer [31]).

We state without proof that the trading strategy defined by (4.1) is maximal in $\mathcal{A}^\lambda(1)$. The proof is postponed to the next subsection.

Proposition 4.4. *The random variable $(1-\lambda)S_{T/2}$ is a maximal element in $\mathcal{C}^\lambda(1)$. Therefore, the trading strategy $(\widehat{\varphi}^0, \widehat{\varphi}^1)$ defined by (4.1) is maximal in $\mathcal{A}^\lambda(1)$.*

Now we are ready to start our proof of Proposition 4.1.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Consider an element $\phi_T^0 \in \mathcal{C}^\lambda(1)$ such that $\phi_T^0 \ne \widehat{\varphi}_T^0 = (1-\lambda)S_{T/2}$. From the maximality of $(\widehat{\varphi}^0, \widehat{\varphi}^1)$, we have $\mathbf{P}\big[\phi_T^0 < \widehat{\varphi}_T^0\big] > 0$. Therefore, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\mathbf{P}\left[\phi_T^0 < \left(1 - \tfrac{1}{k}\right)(1-\lambda)S_{T/2}\right] > 0.$$

Note that $\left\{\phi_T^0 < \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)(1-\lambda)S_{T/2}\right\} \in \mathcal{F}_{T/2}$ and β is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{T/2}$. Then,

$$\mathbf{P}\left[\phi_T^0 < \left(1 - \tfrac{1}{k}\right)(1-\lambda)S_{T/2} \text{ and } 1-\beta < \tfrac{1}{k}\right] > 0,$$

which implies $\mathbf{P}[\phi_T^0 + e_T < 0] > 0$. Consequently, $\mathbf{E}[U(\phi_T^0 + e_T)] = -\infty$.

On the other hand, by the definition of β, we have

$$\widehat{\varphi}_T^0 + e_T = (1-\beta)(1-\lambda)S_{T/2} > 0, \text{ a.s.}$$

Thus, $u(1, e_T) = \mathbf{E}[U(\widehat{\varphi}_T^0 + e_T)] > -\infty$. We complete the proof. □

Remark 4.5. Even without the no-short-selling constraint, $(\widehat{\varphi}^0, \widehat{\varphi}^1)$ is still the unique strategy on $[0, T/2]$ solving the problem (2.2). Indeed, we shall prove in the next subsection that $(\widehat{\varphi}^0, \widehat{\varphi}^1)$ is a maximal trading strategy in a larger space introduced in [6, 8] (still denoted by $\mathcal{A}^\lambda(1)$).

Next, we shall construct a shadow price in the following corollary. It is evident that the shadow price is not unique in our case.

Corollary 4.6. *Define*

$$\widetilde{S}_t := \begin{cases} S_0, & t = 0; \\ \exp\left(B_t + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2\log(1-\lambda)}{T}\right)t\right), & 0 < t < T/2; \\ (1-\lambda)S_{T/2}, & T/2 \le t \le T. \end{cases}$$

Then, the process $\widetilde{S}$ is a shadow price of the utility maximization problem (2.2).

Proof. It follows from the definition of $\widetilde{S}$ that $\widetilde{S} \in [(1-\lambda)S, S]$.

Obviously, the wealth process associated with the buy-hold-sell strategy under $\widetilde{S}$ is $\widetilde{S}$ itself. Thus, we can find an equivalent martingale measure $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{M}^e(\widetilde{S})$, under which this wealth process is a uniformly integrable martingale. By [10, Corollary 4.6], $\widehat{\varphi}_T^0 = \widetilde{S}_T$ is a maximal element in $\mathcal{C}^{\widetilde{S}}(1)$, where

$$\mathcal{C}^{\widetilde{S}}(1) := \left\{ \widetilde{X}_T = 1 + \left(H \bullet \widetilde{S}\right)_T \,\middle|\, H \text{ is admissible} \right\}.$$

Similarly to the proof of Proposition 4.1, one can see that $\widehat{\varphi}_T^0 = \widetilde{S}_T$ solves the utility maximization problem in the frictionless market $u^{\widetilde{S}}(1; e_T)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} u^{\widetilde{S}}(1; e_T) &= \sup_{\widetilde{X}_T \in \mathcal{C}^{\widetilde{S}}(1)} \mathbf{E}\left[U\left(\widetilde{X}_T + e_T\right)\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[U\left(\widetilde{S}_T - \beta(1-\lambda)\widetilde{S}_T\right)\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[U\left((1-\beta)(1-\lambda)S_T\right)\right] = u(1; e_T), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\widetilde{S}$ is the desired shadow price. □

4.2 Proof of Proposition 4.4

In this subsection, we shall prove that (4.1) defines a maximal trading strategy in $\mathcal{A}^\lambda(1)$. Here, $\mathcal{A}^\lambda(1)$ could be the set of admissible trading strategies defined in [6] without no-short-selling constraint.

Proof of Proposition 4.4. Let $\varphi = (\varphi_t^0, \varphi_t^1)_{0 \le t \le T}$ be another trading strategy in $\mathcal{A}^\lambda(1)$. Since the stock-price process S is continuous and the trading strategies are pathwisely of finite variation, we could only consider those (φ^0, φ^1) with right-continuous paths (cf. [8]). In addition, we assume that the agent buys no more stocks after time $T/2$.



Figure 1: Case 1

In what follows, we shall discuss trading strategies φ in two cases and furthermore, we shall prove that the following statement cannot hold

$$\varphi_T^0 \geq \widehat{\varphi}_T^0 = (1-\lambda)S_{T/2}, \text{ a.s. with } \mathbf{P}[\varphi_T^0 > \widehat{\varphi}_T^0] > 0, \tag{4.2}$$

and thus $\widehat{\varphi}$ is a maximal trading strategy in $\mathcal{A}^\lambda(1)$.

Case I. Suppose that there exists a $\gamma > 0$ and a set $B \in \mathcal{F}_{T/2}$ with $\mathbf{P}(B) > 0$ such that for $\omega \in B$, $\varphi_t^1(\omega) \leq 1-\gamma$, $0 \leq t \leq T/2$, $\mathbf{P}$-a.s. (i.e., the holding in stock never excesses $1-\gamma$). Our aim is to construct a set $\overline{B} \in \mathcal{F}_{T/2}$ with $\mathbf{P}(\overline{B}) > 0$, such that for $\omega \in \overline{B}$, $\varphi_T^0(\omega) < \widehat{\varphi}_T^0(\omega)$.

For $\beta > 0$, define $\tau_\beta := \inf\{t > 0 : S_t \geq 1+\beta\} \wedge T/2$. Then, by choosing $\beta \ll \lambda$ sufficiently small, we can find an $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_\beta}$-measurable set defined by

$$B' := \{\omega : \tau_\beta(\omega) < T/2\} \cap \{\omega : 1-\lambda/3 \leq S_t(\omega) \leq 1+\beta,\ 0 \leq t \leq \tau_\beta(\omega)\},$$

such that $\mathbf{P}(B') > 1-\mathbf{P}(B)$. It is obvious that $\mathbf{P}(B' \cap B) > 0$ and for $\omega \in B'$, $S_{\tau_\beta(\omega)}(\omega) = 1+\beta$. Furthermore, we define

$$\widetilde{B}' := B' \cap \{\omega : \varphi_t^1(\omega) \leq 1-\gamma,\ 0 \leq t \leq \tau_\beta(\omega)\} \supseteq B' \cap B.$$

From $\mathbf{P}(B' \cap B) > 0$, we have $\mathbf{P}(\widetilde{B}') > 0$. We now construct a corridor K of stock price on the time interval $[\![\tau_\beta, T/2]\!]$ with width β (see Figure 1). The center point of the corridor at τ_β is $1+\beta$ while at $T/2$ is a sufficiently large number C. Obviously, the stock-price process S has conditional full support (see, e.g., [17]), which implies the set

$$\overline{B}' := \widetilde{B}' \cap \{S \text{ stays in the corridor } K \text{ on } [\![\tau_\beta, T/2]\!]\},$$

has a strictly positive measure, i.e., $\mathbf{P}(\overline{B}') > 0$. For $\omega \in \overline{B}'$, the most advisable trading strategy is to buy $1-\gamma$ stock shares at the lowest price, which should be at least $1-\lambda/3$, and hold them until $T/2$. Therefore,

$$\varphi_T^0(\omega) = V_{T/2}^{liq}(\varphi)(\omega) < (1-\lambda)\big(C + \tfrac{\beta}{2}\big)(1-\gamma) + 1.$$

On the other hand,

$$\widehat{\varphi}_T^0(\omega) = \widehat{\varphi}_{T/2}^0(\omega) > (1-\lambda)\big(C - \tfrac{\beta}{2}\big).$$

By properly choosing $C > \frac{1}{\gamma(1-\lambda)} + \frac{\beta(2-\gamma)}{2\gamma}$, we could ensure that $\varphi_T^0(\omega) < \widehat{\varphi}_T^0(\omega)$.

Case II. Suppose that Case 1 cannot happen, then for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, the following stopping time takes values in $[0, T/2]$:

$$\sigma := \inf\{t > 0 : \varphi_t^1 \geq 1 \text{ or } \varphi_{t-}^1 \geq 1\}.$$

For any stopping times τ and ρ taking values in $[0, T/2]$, $\rho \geq \tau$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} V_\rho^{liq}(\varphi) &= \varphi_\tau^0 + \varphi_\tau^1 S_\tau + \int_\tau^\rho \varphi_t^1 dS_t - \lambda \int_\tau^\rho S_t d\varphi_t^{1,\downarrow} - \lambda S_\rho(\varphi_\rho^1)^+ \\ &= \varphi_\tau^0 + \varphi_\tau^1 S_\tau + \int_\tau^\rho \varphi_t^1 dS_t - \lambda \int_\tau^\rho S_t d\varphi_t^{1,\downarrow} - \lambda S_\rho(\varphi_\rho^1)^+ + \lambda \int_\tau^\rho \varphi_t^1 dS_t - \lambda \int_\tau^\rho \varphi_t^1 dS_t \\ &= \varphi_\tau^0 + (1-\lambda)\varphi_\tau^1 S_\tau + (1-\lambda)\int_\tau^\rho \varphi_t^1 dS_t - \lambda S_\rho(\varphi_\rho^1)^- - \lambda \int_\tau^\rho S_t d\varphi_t^{1,\uparrow}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

In the sequel, we shall consider two situations, i.e.,

(i) For almost every $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\varphi_\sigma^0(\omega) + (1-\lambda)\varphi_\sigma^1(\omega)S_\sigma(\omega) \geq \widehat{\varphi}_\sigma^0(\omega) + (1-\lambda)\widehat{\varphi}_\sigma^1(\omega)S_\sigma(\omega);$$

(ii) There exists an $\mathcal{F}_\sigma$-measurable set D, with $\mathbf{P}(D) > 0$, for $\omega \in D$,

$$\varphi_\sigma^0(\omega) + (1-\lambda)\varphi_\sigma^1(\omega)S_\sigma(\omega) < \widehat{\varphi}_\sigma^0(\omega) + (1-\lambda)\widehat{\varphi}_\sigma^1(\omega)S_\sigma(\omega).$$

Assume that (i) holds, then we observe that for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\varphi_\sigma^0(\omega) + (1-\lambda)\varphi_\sigma^1(\omega)S_\sigma(\omega) = \widehat{\varphi}_\sigma^0(\omega) + (1-\lambda)\widehat{\varphi}_\sigma^1(\omega)S_\sigma(\omega). \tag{4.4}$$

Indeed, if $\varphi_{\sigma(\omega)}^1(\omega) \geq 1$, then

$$\varphi_\sigma^0(\omega) + (1-\lambda)\varphi_\sigma^1(\omega)S_\sigma(\omega) = V_{\sigma(\omega)}^{liq}(\varphi)(\omega) \leq V_{\sigma(\omega)-}^{liq}(\varphi)(\omega);$$

if $\varphi_{\sigma(\omega)}^1(\omega) < 1$, then $\varphi_{\sigma(\omega)-}^1(\omega) \geq 1$, and thus from the self-financing constraint,

$$\varphi_\sigma^0(\omega) + (1-\lambda)\varphi_\sigma^1(\omega)S_\sigma(\omega) \leq \varphi_{\sigma-}^0(\omega) + (1-\lambda)\varphi_{\sigma-}^1(\omega)S_\sigma(\omega) = V_{\sigma(\omega)-}^{liq}(\varphi)(\omega).$$

Consider a frictionless market in which the agent trades for $(1-\lambda)S$, where the agent gains better than trading in the frictional market. Then, we can deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\varphi}_0^0 + \widehat{\varphi}_0^1 S_0 + (1-\lambda)\int_0^\sigma \widehat{\varphi}_t^1 dS_t &= \widehat{\varphi}_\sigma^0 + (1-\lambda)\widehat{\varphi}_\sigma^1 S_\sigma \leq \varphi_\sigma^0 + (1-\lambda)\varphi_\sigma^1 S_\sigma \\ &\leq V_{\sigma-}^{liq}(\varphi) \leq \varphi_0^0 + \varphi_0^1 S_0 + (1-\lambda)\int_0^\sigma \varphi_t^1 dS_t. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi_0^0 + \varphi_0^1 S_0 = \widehat{\varphi}_0^0 + \widehat{\varphi}_0^1 S_0 = 1$ and $\mathbf{1}$ is a maximal trading strategy when trading for S, we can prove (4.4).

Now we calculate $V_T^{liq}(\varphi)$. From (4.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V_T^{liq}(\varphi) &\leq \varphi_\sigma^0 + (1-\lambda)\varphi_\sigma^1 S_\sigma + (1-\lambda)\int_\sigma^T \varphi_t^1 dS_t \\ &= \widehat{\varphi}_0^0 + (1-\lambda)\widehat{\varphi}_0^1 S_0 + (1-\lambda)\int_0^\sigma \widehat{\varphi}_t^1 dS_t + (1-\lambda)\int_\sigma^T \varphi_t^1 dS_t \\ &= \widehat{\varphi}_0^0 + (1-\lambda)\widehat{\varphi}_0^1 S_0 + (1-\lambda)\int_0^T \left(\widehat{\varphi}_t^1 \mathbf{1}_{[\![0,\sigma]\!]}(t) + \varphi_t^1 \mathbf{1}_{[\![\sigma,T]\!]}(t)\right) dS_t. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

It is obvious that trading for S, $((\widehat{\varphi}_\cdot^1 \mathbf{1}_{[\![0,\sigma]\!]}(\cdot) + \varphi_\cdot^1 \mathbf{1}_{[\![\sigma,T]\!]}(\cdot)) \bullet S)$ is uniformly bounded from below, and thus admissible. Comparing (4.5) with

$$V_T^{liq}(\widehat{\varphi}) = \widehat{\varphi}_0^0 + (1-\lambda)\widehat{\varphi}_0^1 S_0 + (1-\lambda)\int_0^T \widehat{\varphi}_t^1 dS_t,$$

we can conclude from the maximality of $\int_0^T \mathbf{1} dS_t$ that (4.2) cannot happen.

On the other hand, if (ii) holds, then by similar reasoning, we have for $\omega \in D$,

$$\begin{aligned} V_T^{liq}(\varphi) &< \widehat{\varphi}_0^0 + (1-\lambda)\widehat{\varphi}_0^1 S_0 + (1-\lambda)\int_0^\sigma \widehat{\varphi}_t^1 dS_t + (1-\lambda)\int_\sigma^T \varphi_t^1 dS_t \\ &= \widehat{\varphi}_0^0 + (1-\lambda)\widehat{\varphi}_0^1 S_0 + (1-\lambda)\int_0^T \left(\widehat{\varphi}_t^1 \mathbf{1}_{[\![0,\sigma]\!]}(t) + \varphi_t^1 \mathbf{1}_D \mathbf{1}_{[\![\sigma,T]\!]}(t)\right) dS_t. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Again, $((\widehat{\varphi}^1 \mathbf{1}_{[\![0,\sigma]\!]} + \varphi^1 \mathbf{1}_D \mathbf{1}_{[\![\sigma,T]\!]}) \bullet S)$ is uniformly bounded from below when trading for S, and thus admissible. Comparing $\left((\widehat{\varphi}^1 \mathbf{1}_{[\![0,\sigma]\!]} + \varphi^1 \mathbf{1}_D \mathbf{1}_{[\![\sigma,T]\!]}) \bullet S\right)_T$ with $(\mathbf{1} \bullet S)_T$, we can conclude that either for almost every $\omega \in D$,

$$\left((\widehat{\varphi}^1 \mathbf{1}_{[\![0,\sigma]\!]} + \varphi^1 \mathbf{1}_D \mathbf{1}_{[\![\sigma,T]\!]}) \bullet S\right)_T = (\mathbf{1} \bullet S)_T,$$

or there exists a subset $D' \subset D$, $D' \in \mathcal{F}_{T/2}$, such that for $\omega \in D'$,

$$\left((\widehat{\varphi}^1 \mathbf{1}_{[\![0,\sigma]\!]} + \varphi^1 \mathbf{1}_D \mathbf{1}_{[\![\sigma,T]\!]}) \bullet S\right)_T < (\mathbf{1} \bullet S)_T.$$

In particular, we exclude (4.2) by recalling (4.6). □

5 Appendix

In this section, we shall prove directly the existence and uniqueness of the primal optimizer (Theorem 3.5) by reorganizing [29, Section 3.3]. In particular, we find that the assumption $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \geq 0$ in [29, Lemma 3.16] is not essentially needed for proceeding the argument.

Firstly, we introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose $\{f_n\}_{n\in N}$ is a sequence in L^1, $f_n \to f_0 \in L^0$, almost surely. Moreover, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}[f_n]$ is finite and f_0^+ is integrable. We denote $\alpha := \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}[f_n] - \mathbf{E}[f_0]$. In particular, if $\mathbf{E}[f_0] = -\infty$, we note $\alpha := \infty$. Then, we have*

(i) For any $M > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\big[f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{f_n \geq M\}}\big] \geq \alpha. \tag{5.1}$$

(ii) For any $\alpha' < \alpha$ and $M > 0$, there exists a subsequence $\{f_{n_k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and a sequence of disjoint sets $(A_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, such that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $f_{n_k} \geq M$ on A_k, and

$$\mathbf{E}\big[f_{n_k} \mathbf{1}_{A_k}\big] \geq \alpha'.$$

Proof. (i) We suppose, contrary to our claim (5.1), there exists $M > 0$, such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\big[f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{f_n \geq M\}}\big] =: \beta < \alpha, \tag{5.2}$$

which implies the boundedness of $\{\mathbf{E}[f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{f_n \geq M\}}]\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Suppose $\mathbf{E}[f_0] = -\infty$, then we have

$$\mathbf{E}\big[f_0 \mathbf{1}_{\{f_0 < M\}}\big] \leq \mathbf{E}[f_0] = -\infty.$$

Thus,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\big[f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{f_n < M\}}\big] \leq \mathbf{E}\big[f_0 \mathbf{1}_{\{f_0 < M\}}\big] = -\infty. \tag{5.3}$$

From (5.3) and (5.2), we can conclude that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\{\mathbf{E}[f_n]\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} = -\infty$, which contradicts to the assumption. Therefore, $\mathbf{E}[f_0] \in \mathbb{R}$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\big[f_0 \mathbf{1}_{\{f_0 < M\}}\big] &\geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\big[f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{f_n < M\}}\big] \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}[f_n] - \liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\big[f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{f_n \geq M\}}\big] \\ &\geq \mathbf{E}[f_0] + \alpha - \beta, \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

where the equality is deduced from the convergence of $\{\mathbf{E}[f_n]\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and the boundedness of $\{\mathbf{E}[f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{f_n \geq M\}}]\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Obviously, (5.4) is a contradiction.

(ii) We first consider the case that $\alpha < \infty$. Fix α', M and denote by $\varepsilon := \alpha - \alpha'$. We now construct inductively a subsequence $\{f_{n_k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ as well as a sequence $\{\mathcal{A}^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $\mathcal{A}^m$ consists of m subsets of Ω, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{A}^m := \{A_1^m, A_2^m, \ldots, A_m^m\},\ m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $M_1 = M$. From (i), we could choose n_1 such that $\mathbf{E}\big[f_{n_1} \mathbf{1}_{\{f_{n_1} \geq M_1\}}\big] \geq \alpha$ and define $A_1^1 := \{f_{n_1} \geq M_1\}$. Suppose that $\{f_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^N$ and $\{\mathcal{A}^m\}_{m=1}^N$ are well-defined and we now define $f_{n_{N+1}}$ and $\mathcal{A}^{N+1}$. Note that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\widetilde{M} > 0$,

$$\mathbf{E}\big[\mathbf{1}_{\{f_n \geq \widetilde{M}\}}\big] = \mathbf{E}\big[\mathbf{1}_{\{f_n^+ \geq \widetilde{M}\}}\big] \leq \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n^+ - f_0^+| \geq \frac{\widetilde{M}}{2}\}}\right] + \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{1}_{\{f_0^+ \geq \frac{\widetilde{M}}{2}\}}\right].$$

Thus, by the integrability of f_0^+, f_1, f_2, …, f_N and Markov's inequality, one can choose $M_{N+1} \geq M_N$ sufficiently large, such that for any $n \geq n_N$ and $k = 1, 2, \ldots N$,

$$\mathbf{E}\big[|f_n| \mathbf{1}_{\{f_{n_{N+1}} \geq M_{N+1}\}}\big] \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{N+1}}.$$

Then, we fix $n_{N+1} \geq n_N$ satisfying $\mathbf{E}[f_{n_{N+1}} \mathbf{1}_{\{f_{n_{N+1}} \geq M_{N+1}\}}] \geq \alpha$ and define $A_{N+1}^{N+1} := \{f_{n_{N+1}} \geq M_{N+1}\}$ and $A_k^{N+1} := A_k^N \backslash A_{N+1}^{N+1}$. Note that the sequence $\{\mathcal{A}^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ we defined above has the following properties:

(a) For each k, $\{A_k^m\}_{m\geq k}$ is decreasing in m;

(b) For each m, $A_1^m, A_2^m, \ldots, A_m^m$ are disjoint;

(c) For each k and $m \geq k$,

$$\mathbf{E}[f_{n_k}\mathbf{1}_{A_k^m}] \geq \alpha - \sum_{i=k}^{m-1} \frac{\varepsilon}{2^i} > \alpha'.$$

Letting $A_k := \bigcap_{m\geq k} A_k^m$. It is easy to verify that the sequences $\{f_{n_k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{A_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ yield the desired result.

If $\alpha = \infty$, we could complete the proof by a similar argument. □

Proof of Theorem 3.5. The uniqueness is trivial due to the strict concavity of U. Thus, we only have to show the existence.

(i) Since $u(x; e_T) < \infty$, we could pick a maximizing sequence for (2.2), i.e.,

$$u(x; e_T) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}[U(g_n + e_T)].$$

By passing to a sequence of convex combinations $g_n' \in \mathrm{conv}(g_n, g_{n+1}, \ldots)$, still denoted by g_n, and applying the Komlós type theorem as well as Lemma 3.4, we may suppose that g_n converges a.s. to $\widehat{g} \in \mathcal{C}^\lambda(x)$.

(ii) It is easy to verify that u is still a concave function in x and thus $u(x; e_T) < \infty$ implies $u(x+1; e_T) < \infty$. We claim that $\mathbf{E}[(U(\widehat{g} + e_T))^+] < +\infty$. If not, we could deduce that $u(x+1; e_T) = \infty$, which is impossible. Therefore, $\mathbf{E}[U(\widehat{g} + e_T)]$ exists.

(iii) We now prove that $\widehat{g}$ is the primal optimizer. If not, there exists an $\alpha \in (0, \infty]$ such that

$$\alpha = u(x; e_T) - \mathbf{E}[U(\widehat{g} + e_T)].$$

For each n, denote by $f_n = U(g_n + e_T)$. Fixing $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for each $n \geq n_0$,

$$u(x; e_T) - \mathbf{E}[f_n] \leq \varepsilon. \tag{5.5}$$

Since $AE(U) < 1$, by Lemma 6.3 in [24], there exists some $\gamma > 1$, such that $U(\frac{x}{2}) > \frac{\gamma}{2}U(x)$, for all $x \geq x_0 > 0$. From Lemma 5.1, we can choose sufficiently large $M > 0$ and $m > n \geq n_0$, such that $U^{-1}(M) \geq 2x_0$,

$$\mathbf{E}\big[|f_n|\mathbf{1}_{\{f_m\geq M\}}\big] \leq \varepsilon \text{ and } \mathbf{E}\big[f_m\mathbf{1}_{\{f_m\geq M\}}\big] \geq \alpha - \varepsilon. \tag{5.6}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\left[U\left(\frac{g_n+g_m}{2}+e_T\right)\right] &= \mathbf{E}\left[U\left(\frac{g_n+g_m}{2}+e_T\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{f_m\geq M\}}\right] \\ &\quad + \mathbf{E}\left[U\left(\frac{g_n+g_m}{2}+e_T\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{f_m<M\}}\right].\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, due to the positivity of g_n, g_m and e_T, we have

$$\mathbf{E}\left[U\left(\frac{g_n+g_m}{2}+e_T\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{f_m\geq M\}}\right] \geq \frac{\gamma}{2}\mathbf{E}\left[U\left(g_n+g_m+2e_T\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{f_m\geq M\}}\right] \geq \frac{\gamma}{2}\mathbf{E}\left[f_m\mathbf{1}_{\{f_m\geq M\}}\right]$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}\left[U\left(\frac{g_n+g_m}{2}+e_T\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{f_m<M\}}\right]\geq\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}\left[f_n\mathbf{1}_{\{f_m<M\}}\right]+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}\left[f_m\mathbf{1}_{\{f_m<M\}}\right].$$

Therefore, we can deduce from (5.5) and (5.6),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\left[U\left(\frac{g_n+g_m}{2}+e_T\right)\right]&\geq\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}\left[f_n\mathbf{1}_{\{f_m<M\}}\right]+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}\left[f_m\right]+\frac{\gamma-1}{2}\mathbf{E}\left[f_m\mathbf{1}_{\{f_m\geq M\}}\right]\\&\geq u(x;e_T)+\frac{(\gamma-1)\alpha}{2}-\frac{\gamma+2}{2}\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\varepsilon\to 0$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}\left[U\left(\frac{g_n+g_m}{2}+e_T\right)\right]>u(x;e_T),$$

which is a contradiction to the maximality of $u(x;e_T)$. □

Acknowledgement: The authors are grateful to Prof. W. Schachermayer for his suggestions for the organization of Appendix, in particular, for the formulation of Lemma 5.1.

References

[1] E. Bayraktar and X. Yu. Optimal investment with random endowments and transaction costs: duality theory and shadow prices. *Preprint*, 2015.

[2] G. Benedetti, L. Campi, J. Kallsen, and J. Muhle-Karbe. On the existence of shadow prices. *Finance and Stochastics*, 17(4):801–818, 2013.

[3] J. Choi, M. Sirbu, and G. Žitković. Shadow prices and well-posedness in the problem of optimal investment and consumption with transaction costs. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 51(6):4414–4449, 2013.

[4] J. Cvitanić and I. Karatzas. Hedging and portfolio optimization under transaction costs: a martingale approach. *Mathematical Finance*, 6(2):133–165, 1996.

[5] C. Czichowsky, J. Muhle-Karbe, and W. Schachermayer. Transaction costs, shadow prices, and duality in discrete time. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 5(1):258–277, 2014.

[6] C. Czichowsky and W. Schachermayer. Duality theory for portfolio optimisation under transaction costs. *to appear in Annals of Applied Probability*, 2015.

[7] C. Czichowsky and W. Schachermayer. Portfolio optimisation beyond semimartingales: shadow prices and fractional Brownian motion. *Preprint*, 2015.

[8] C. Czichowsky, W. Schachermayer, and J. Yang. Shadow prices for continuous processes. *to appear in Mathematical Finance*, 2015.

[9] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer. A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing. *Mathematische Annalen*, 300(1):463–520, 1994.

[10] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer. The no-arbitrage property under a change of numéraire. *Stochastics and Stochastics Reports*, 53(3-4):213–226, 1995.

[11] N. El Karoui. Les aspects probabilistes du contrôle stochastique. In *Ninth Saint Flour Probability Summer School—1979 (Saint Flour, 1979)*, volume 876 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 73–238. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1981.

[12] S. Gerhold, P. Guasoni, J. Muhle-Karbe, and W. Schachermayer. Transaction costs, trading volume, and the liquidity premium. *Finance and Stochastics*, 18(1):1–37, 2014.

[13] S. Gerhold, J. Muhle-Karbe, and W. Schachermayer. The dual optimizer for the growth-optimal portfolio under transaction costs. *Finance and Stochastics*, 17(2):325–354, 2013.

[14] T. Goll and J. Kallsen. A complete explicit solution to the log-optimal portfolio problem. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 13(2):774–799, 2003.

[15] P. Guasoni. Optimal investment with transaction costs and without semimartingales. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 12(4):1227–1246, 2002.

[16] P. Guasoni. No arbitrage under transaction costs, with fractional Brownian motion and beyond. *Mathematical Finance*, 16(3):569–582, 2006.

[17] P. Guasoni, M. Rásonyi, and W. Schachermayer. Consistent price systems and face-lifting pricing under transaction costs. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 18(2):491–520, 2008.

[18] A. Herczegh and V. Prokaj. Shadow price in the power utility case. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 25(5):2671–2707, 2015.

[19] J. Jacod and A. Shiryaev. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*, volume 288 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, 2003.

[20] Y. Kabanov and M. Safarian. *Markets with transaction costs*. Springer Finance. Springer-Verlag, 2009.

[21] J. Kallsen and J. Muhle-Karbe. On Using Shadow Prices in Portfolio Optimization with Transaction Costs. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 20(4):1341–1358, 2010.

[22] J. Kallsen and J. Muhle-Karbe. Existence of shadow prices in finite probability spaces. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 73(2):251–262, 2011.

[23] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.

[24] D. Kramkov and W. Schachermayer. The asymptotic elasticity of utility functions and optimal investment in incomplete markets. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 9(3):904–950, 1999.

[25] D. Kramkov and W. Schachermayer. Necessary and sufficient conditions in the problem of optimal investment in incomplete markets. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 13(4):1504–1516, 2003.

[26] Y. Lin and J. Yang. Utility maximization problem with random endowment and transaction costs: when wealth becomes negative. *Preprint*, 2016.

[27] H. Liu and M. Loewenstein. Optimal portfolio selection with transaction costs and finite horizons. *Review of Financial Studies*, 15(3):805–835, 2002.

[28] M. Loewenstein. On optimal portfolio trading strategies for an investor facing transactions costs in a continuous trading market. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 33(2):209–228, 2000.

[29] W. Schachermayer. *Portfolio optimization in incomplete financial markets.* Cattedra Galileiana. [Galileo Chair]. Scuola Normale Superiore, Classe di Scienze, Pisa, 2004.

[30] W. Schachermayer. Admissible trading strategies under transaction costs. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XLVI*, volume 2123 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 317–331. Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 2014.

[31] W. Schachermayer. The super-replication theorem under proportional transaction costs revisited. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 8(4):383–398, 2014.